

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,333	11/14/2001	Larry Wayne Oberley	875.042US1	5690
21186 7590 05/14/2007 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MUNDEA BOLLS, AND 55402			EXAMINER	
			BOWMAN, AMY HUDSON	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1635	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	09/993,333	OBERLEY ET.AL		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Amy H. Bowman	1635		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDON	DN. timely filed m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status	•			
1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Fe 2a) □ This action is FINAL. 2b) ⊠ This 3) □ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, p			
Disposition of Claims				
 4)	thdrawn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11).	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summal Paper No(s)/Mail (5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date		

Application/Control Number: 09/993,333

Art Unit: 1635

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

The following is a supplemental restriction requirement necessitated by applicant's amendments to the claims filed on 2/23/07.

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 2, 3, 6-8, 11-15, 27, 30 and 31, drawn to an antisense oligonucleotide specific for human manganese superoxide dismutase and to a method of treating a tumor, more specifically a breast cancer tumor via administering the antisense oligonucleotide, classified in class 514, subclass 44.
- II. Claims 2, 3, 6-8, 11-15, 28, 30 and 31, drawn to an antisense oligonucleotide specific for human manganese superoxide dismutase and to a method of treating a tumor, more specifically a glioma tumor via administering the antisense oligonucleotide, classified in class 514, subclass 44.
- III. Claims 2, 3, 6-8, 11-15, and 29-31, drawn to an antisense oligonucleotide specific for human manganese superoxide dismutase and to a method of treating a tumor, more specifically a melanoma tumor via administering the antisense oligonucleotide, classified in class 514, subclass 44.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of groups I-III are directed to related compounds and methods. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed have a materially different design and effect based on the specific tumor type to be treated. The inventions are directed to treating breast cancer, glioma and melanoma, respectively, each of which has completely different etiologic considerations. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants. To search for a method of treating one of the cancer types with an oligonucleotide would not necessarily return art against a method of treating any of the other cancer types with an oligonucleotide. To search for more than one of the inventions in the same application presents a search and corresponding examination burden.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Claim 8 link(s) the inventions of each group. The restriction requirement among the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claim 8.

Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy H. Bowman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0755.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Schultz can be reached on (571) 272-0763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Amy H Bowman Examiner Art Unit 1635

AHB

ION E. ANGELL PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER